

REMARKS/DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

The Office Action dated September 28, 2004 has been reviewed and carefully considered. Claims 1-10 are pending, of which the independent claims remain 1, 7 and 9. Claims 1-10 have been amended to put them in better form. Reconsideration of the above-identified application, as amended and in view of the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for indication that claims 1-10 are allowable over the prior art references.

The Office Action rejected the Information Disclosure Statement for failing to submit the relevant reference in a separate paper. In response, a new information disclosure statement complying with 37 CFR 1.98(b) is submitted herein.

The Office Action objected the drawings as they fail to show labels or definitions of each of the boxes as described in the specification. In response, proposed drawing corrections to Figures 1 and 2 are submitted herein in the form of replacement figures.

The Office Action rejected claim 5 as being in improper form. In response, claim 5 has been amended to only depend on claim 1.

The Office Action objected to the specification as it contains an embedded hyperlink. In response, the specification

has been amended to delete the hyperlink.

The Office Action objected the abstract as it is not a single paragraph. In response, the abstract has been amended to comply with the Office Action requirement.

The Office Action objected to the Information Disclosure Statement as failing to list the references in the specification in a separate paper. In response, a new Information Disclosure Statement is enclosed herein.

The Office Action required a new title indicative of the invention. In response, the title has been amended to clearly indicate the invention. In particular, the title now recites, **"Communication system and device for controlling a plurality of electronic devices."**

Having made the corrections indicated above, applicants submits that the reason for the Office Actions' objections and rejections have been overcome. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the above grounds of rejections and objections are respectfully requested.

Further, the Office Action rejected the arrangement of the specification as they fail to include section headings.

Applicants respectfully submit that 37 CFR §1.77(b) discloses a *suggested* format for the arrangement of the

disclosure. Applicants respectfully submit that the present disclosure follows the suggested format where applicable. With regard to 37 CFR§1.77(c), which was not cited in the Office Action, Applicants respectfully submit that section headings are suggested but not required, as 37 CFR §1.77(c) clearly states the sections defined in paragraphs (b) (1) through (b) (11) "should" be preceded by a section heading. Applicants respectfully decline at this time to amend the disclosure to include same.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this ground of rejection are respectfully requested.


Conclusion:

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections and objections of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application to be in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Eric Bram
Registration No. 37,285

Date: November 24, 2004


By: Steve Cha
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,069

Enclosures:
Figs. 1 and 2

Mail all correspondence to:
Eric Bram, Registration No. 37,285
US PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
Phone: (914) 333-9635
Fax: (914) 332-0615